

REMARKS

The Office Action of September 25, 2007 has been received and carefully reviewed. It is submitted that, by this Amendment, all bases of rejection are traversed and overcome. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 4-11 and 14-20 remain in the application. Claims 21-23, 25-31, 33-38, 40-42 and 44 are cancelled herein. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to correct minor typographical errors. It is submitted that no new matter has been added in view of the amendments to the claim.

Claims 1, 4-11, 14-23, 25-31 and 33-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon (U.S. Patent No. 6,701,304).

At the outset, Applicant submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 21-23, 25-31 and 33-36 is moot in view of the fact that such claims are cancelled herein.

Regarding claims 1 and 11, the Examiner states (in response to Applicant's Amendment dated June 21, 2007) that Leon discloses a marking reader that detects one or more identifiers in an identifier portion of the postage label, and a computer that receives information from the reader and provides a status signal that indicates whether the postage label is authentic (citing column 3, lines 4-8 of Leon). From this teaching, the Examiner concludes that Leon discloses generating security information from the retrieved information.

Applicant's claims 1 and 11 recite, in some form, that visible mark information and non-visible mark information is processed "to **generate postage information** for the mail piece" (emphasis added). As defined in Applicant's specification as filed, at page 6, lines 22-23, "[p]ostage information includes any information that is related to the **delivery** of a mail piece" (emphasis added). Examples of postage information include a postage amount, a date, an origination address, a destination address, security information, or the like (see page 9, line 24 through page 10, line 1).

In sharp contrast, column 3, lines 4-8 of Leon (as cited by the Examiner) discloses an embodiment of a postage label **authentication** system. This system uses data, symbology, and marking readers to read/detect human-readable and machine-readable indicia printed on a postage label. A computer receives information from the readers and provides a **status signal that indicates whether the postage label is authentic.**

Generally, a “signal” is defined as “something (as a sound, gesture, or object) that **conveys notice** or warning” (emphasis added). (See <http://www.webster.com/dictionary/signal>). The term “status” is defined as the “**state or condition** with respect to circumstances” (emphasis added). (See <http://www.webster.com/dictionary/status>). Based on these definitions, a “status signal” is, thus, something that conveys notice or warning regarding the state or condition of a circumstance. In particular, Leon’s status signal indicates whether the label is authentic, and this determination is based upon the indicia printed thereon. The signal of Leon indicates either yes, the label is authentic or no, the label is not authentic. As such, the status signal of Leon (i.e., a signal indicative of label authenticity) is **not** the same as, nor does it render obvious, postage **information**, i.e., information relating to the **delivery** of a mail piece, as the phrase is defined by the Applicant.

In view of the above, Applicant submits 1) that Leon **fails** to disclose, suggest, or even imply that the computer generates **postage information** (e.g., security information), and 2) that Leon also **fails** to teach all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 11. As such, Applicant further submits that the invention as defined in independent claims 1 and 11, and in those claims depending ultimately therefrom, is not anticipated, taught or rendered obvious by Leon, either alone or in combination, and patentably defines over the art of record.

Claims 37, 38, 40-42 and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leon in view of Berson, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,039,257). It is

submitted that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 37, 38, 40-42 and 44 is moot in view of the fact that such claims are cancelled herein.

In summary, claims 1, 4-11 and 14-20 remain in the application. It is submitted that, through this Amendment, Applicant's invention as set forth in these claims is now in a condition suitable for allowance.

Further and favorable consideration is requested. If the Examiner believes it would expedite prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's Attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

DIERKER & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

/Juliet R. Kavanaugh/

Juliet R. Kavanaugh
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 53424
(248) 649-9900, ext. 29
julietk@troypatent.com

3331 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 109
Troy, Michigan 48084-2813
Dated: December 21, 2007
JCD/AMS/JRK